



2026:CGHC:23917-DB



2026:CGHC:23917-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WA No. 466 of 2026

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department of Home Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, New Raipur Chhattisgarh

2 - The Director General Jail And Corrective Service Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

3 - The Jail Superintendent Central Jail Jagdalpur District- Bastar Chhattisgarh

... Appellants

versus

Sanjay Kumar Sahu S/o Puran Lal Sahu Aged About 35 Years Jail Warder, District Jail Mungeli, District- Mungeli Chhattisgarh

... Respondent

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Appellants	:	Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, Deputy Advocate General
For Respondent	:	Mr. Bharat Lal Dembra, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

16.06.2026

1. Heard Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, learned Deputy Advocate General appearing for the State/appellants on I.A. No.01/2026, which is



an application for condonation of delay of 86 days in preferring the present writ appeal.

2. Mr. Bhaduri submits that the present writ appeal has been preferred against the order dated 21.11.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(S) No. 2623/2023, however, there has occurred a delay of 86 days in filing the same. He further submits that the delay in filing the present writ appeal is neither deliberate nor intentional, but has occurred on account of the administrative procedure required for obtaining the necessary approvals and legal opinion from the competent authorities. It is submitted that immediately upon receipt of the order passed by the learned Single Judge, the same was forwarded through the concerned jail authorities to the Jail Headquarters and thereafter to the Home Department for consideration.

3. Learned counsel further submits that after examining the matter, the Home Department sought legal opinion from the office of the Advocate General regarding the feasibility of challenging the order under appeal. Upon receipt of a favourable opinion, the matter was processed through the Department of Law and Legislative Affairs, which accorded permission for filing the writ appeal, whereafter an Officer-in-Charge was appointed and instructed to take immediate steps for preferring the appeal. It is contended that the appellants have furnished a complete and satisfactory day-to-day explanation for the delay and that the appeal has been filed promptly after completion of the requisite governmental formalities. The delay, therefore, being bona fide and



sufficiently explained, deserves to be condoned in the interest of justice so that the matter may be decided on merits.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for respondent opposes the prayer for condonation of delay and submits that the appellants have failed to show any sufficient cause for the inordinate delay in filing the present writ appeal. It is further submitted that the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge is well reasoned and does not call for any interference. Therefore, the application for condonation of delay deserves to be dismissed.

5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of ***Postmaster General and others v. Living Media India Limited and another, (2012) 3 SCC 563***, has dealt with the limitation issue and held as under:-

“27. It is not in dispute that the person(s) concerned were well aware or conversant with the issues involved including the prescribed period of limitation for taking up the matter by way of filing a special leave petition in this Court. They cannot claim that they have a separate period of limitation when the Department was possessed with competent persons familiar with court proceedings. In the absence of plausible and acceptable explanation, we are posing a question why the delay is to be condoned mechanically merely because the Government or a wing of the Government is a party before us.

28. Though we are conscious of the fact that in a matter of condonation of delay when there



was no gross negligence or deliberate inaction or lack of bonafide, a liberal concession has to be adopted to advance substantial justice, we are of the view that in the facts and circumstances, the Department cannot take advantage of various earlier decisions. The claim on account of impersonal machinery and inherited bureaucratic methodology of making several notes cannot be accepted in view of the modern technologies being used and available. The law of limitation undoubtedly binds everybody including the Government.

29. In our view, it is the right time to inform all the government bodies, their agencies and instrumentalities that unless they have reasonable and acceptable explanation for the delay and there was bonafide effort, there is no need to accept the usual explanation that the file was kept pending for several months/years due to considerable degree of procedural red-tape in the process. The government departments are under a special obligation to ensure that they perform their duties with diligence and commitment. Condonation of delay is an exception and should not be used as an anticipated benefit for government departments. The law shelters everyone under the same light and should not be swirled for the benefit of a few.

30. Considering the fact that there was no proper explanation offered by the Department for the delay except mentioning of various



dates, according to us, the Department has miserably failed to give any acceptable and cogent reasons sufficient to condone such a huge delay. Accordingly, the appeals are liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay.”

6. Recently, the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the matter of **State of Madhya Pradesh v. Ramkumar Choudhary, 2024 INSC 932**, while considering the delay, issued some directions and observed as follows:-

“5. The legal position is that where a case has been presented in the Court beyond limitation, the petitioner has to explain the Court as to what was the "sufficient cause" which means an adequate and enough reason which prevented him to approach the Court within limitation. In Majji Sannemma v. Reddy Sridevi, 2021 SCC Online SC 1260, it was held by this Court that even though limitation may harshly affect the rights of a party, it has to be applied with all its rigour when prescribed by statute. A reference was also made to the decision of this Court in Ajay Dabra v. Pyare Ram, 2023 SCC Online 92 wherein, it was held as follows:

"13. This Court in the case of Basawaraj v. Special Land Acquisition Officer [(2013) 14 SCC 81] while rejecting an application for condonation of delay for lack of sufficient cause has concluded in Paragraph 15 as follows:

“15. The law on the issue can be summarised to the effect that where a case has been presented in the court beyond



limitation, the applicant has to explain the court as to what was the “sufficient cause” which means an adequate and enough reason which prevented him to approach the court within limitation. In case a party is found to be negligent, or for want of bona fide on his part in the facts and circumstances of the case, or found to have not acted diligently or remained inactive, there cannot be a justified ground to condone the delay. No court could be justified in condoning such an inordinate delay by imposing any condition whatsoever. The application is to be decided only within the parameters laid down by this Court in regard to the condonation of delay. In case there was no sufficient cause to prevent a litigant to approach the court on time condoning the delay without any justification, putting any condition whatsoever, amounts to passing an order in violation of the statutory provisions and it tantamounts to showing utter disregard to the legislature.”

14. Therefore, we are of the considered opinion that the High Court did not commit any mistake in dismissing the delay condonation application of the present appellant.”

Thus, it is crystal clear that the discretion to condone the delay has to be exercised judiciously based on facts and circumstances



of each case and that, the expression 'sufficient cause' cannot be liberally interpreted, if negligence, inaction or lack of bona fides is attributed to the party.

5.1. In Union of India v. Jahangir Byramji Jeejeebhoy (D) through his legal heir, 2024 INSC 262, wherein, one of us (J.B.Pardiwala, J) was a member, after referring to various decisions on the issue, it was in unequivocal terms observed by this Court that delay should not be excused as a matter of generosity and rendering substantial justice is not to cause prejudice to the opposite party. The relevant passage of the same is profitably extracted below:

“24. In the aforesaid circumstances, we made it very clear that we are not going to look into the merits of the matter as long as we are not convinced that sufficient cause has been made out for condonation of such a long and inordinate delay.

25. It hardly matters whether a litigant is a private party or a State or Union of India when it comes to condoning the gross delay of more than 12 years. If the litigant chooses to approach the court long after the lapse of the time prescribed under the relevant provisions of the law, then he cannot turn around and say that no prejudice would be caused to either side by the delay being condoned. This litigation between the parties started sometime in 1981. We are in 2024.



Almost 43 years have elapsed. However, till date the respondent has not been able to reap the fruits of his decree. It would be a mockery of justice if we condone the delay of 12 years and 158 days and once again ask the respondent to undergo the rigmarole of the legal proceedings.

26. The length of the delay is a relevant matter which the court must take into consideration while considering whether the delay should be condoned or not. From the tenor of the approach of the appellants, it appears that they want to fix their own period of limitation for instituting the proceedings for which law has prescribed a period of limitation. Once it is held that a party has lost his right to have the matter considered on merits because of his own inaction for a long, it cannot be presumed to be non-deliberate delay and in such circumstances of the case, he cannot be heard to plead that the substantial justice deserves to be preferred as against the technical considerations. While considering the plea for condonation of delay, the court must not start with the merits of the main matter. The court owes a duty to first ascertain the bona fides of the explanation offered by the party seeking condonation. It is only if the sufficient cause assigned by the litigant and the opposition of the other side is equally balanced that the court may bring into aid the merits of the matter for the purpose of condoning the delay.



27. We are of the view that the question of limitation is not merely a technical consideration. The rules of limitation are based on the principles of sound public policy and principles of equity. We should not keep the 'Sword of Damocles' hanging over the head of the respondent for indefinite period of time to be determined at the whims and fancies of the appellants.

xxx xxx xxx

34. In view of the aforesaid, we have reached to the conclusion that the High Court committed no error much less any error of law in passing the impugned order. Even otherwise, the High Court was exercising its supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

35. In a plethora of decisions of this Court, it has been said that delay should not be excused as a matter of generosity. Rendering substantial justice is not to cause prejudice to the opposite party. The appellants have failed to prove that they were reasonably diligent in prosecuting the matter and this vital test for condoning the delay is not satisfied in this case.

36. For all the foregoing reasons, this appeal fails and is hereby dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs."

Applying the above legal proposition to the facts of the present case, we are of the opinion



that the High Court correctly refused to condone the delay and dismissed the appeal by observing that such inordinate delay was not explained satisfactorily, no sufficient cause was shown for the same, and no plausible reason was put forth by the State. Therefore, we are inclined to reject this petition at the threshold.

6. At the same time, we cannot simply brush aside the delay occurred in preferring the second appeal, due to callous and lackadaisical attitude on the part of the officials functioning in the State machinery. Though the Government adopts systematic approach in handling the legal issues and preferring the petitions/applications/appeals well within the time, due to the fault on the part of the officials in merely communicating the information on time, huge revenue loss will be caused to the Government exchequer. The present case is one such case, wherein, enormous delay of 1788 days occasioned in preferring the second appeal due to the lapses on the part of the officials functioning under the State, though valuable Government lands were involved. Therefore, we direct the State to streamline the machinery touching the legal issues, offering legal opinion, filing of cases before the Tribunal / Courts, etc., fix the responsibility on the officer(s) concerned, and penalize the officer(s), who is/are responsible for delay, deviation, lapses, etc., if any, to the value of the loss caused to the Government. Such direction will have to be followed by all the States



scrupulously.

7. There is one another aspect of the matter which we must not ignore or overlook. Over a period of time, we have noticed that whenever there is a plea for condonation of delay be it at the instance of a private litigant or State the delay is sought to be explained right from the time, the limitation starts and if there is a delay of say 2 years or 3 years or 4 years till the end of the same. For example if the period of limitation is 90 days then the party seeking condonation has to explain why it was unable to institute the proceedings within that period of limitation. What events occurred after the 91st day till the last is of no consequence. The court is required to consider what came in the way of the party that it was unable to file it between the 1st day and the 90th day. It is true that a party is entitled to wait until the last day of limitation for filing an appeal. But when it allows the limitation to expire and pleads sufficient cause for not filing the appeal earlier, the sufficient cause must establish that because of some event or circumstance arising before the limitation expired it was not possible to file the appeal within time. No event or circumstance arising after the expiry of limitation can constitute such sufficient cause. There may be events or circumstances subsequent to the expiry of limitation which may further delay the filing of the appeal. But that the limitation has been allowed to expire without the appeal being filed must be traced to a cause arising



within the period of limitation. (See: Ajit Singh Thakur Singh and Another v. State of Gujarat, AIR 1981 SC 733)."

7. Taking into account the facts and circumstances of the present case, in the light of aforementioned judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matters of **Postmaster General** (supra) and **Ramkumar Choudhary** (supra), it is evident that Government Departments/Public Sector Undertakings are under a special obligation to discharge their duties with due diligence and commitment. Condonation of delay is an exception, not the rule, and cannot be claimed as a matter of right or anticipated privilege by Government Entities/Public Sector Undertakings. The law casts its protection equally upon all litigants and cannot be distorted to confer undue advantage upon a select few.

8. Upon considering the matter in its entirety and in light of the chronology placed on record, we find that the impugned judgment and order was passed on 21.11.2025, whereas the present writ appeal has been filed after a delay of about 86 days beyond the prescribed period of limitation of 45 days under Section 2(1) of the *Chhattisgarh High Court (Appeal to Division Bench) Act, 2006*. The explanation furnished by the appellants indicates that after passing of the impugned order, the matter underwent necessary administrative processing including inter-departmental correspondence, seeking and obtaining legal opinion from the Office of the learned Advocate General, and consideration at various levels of the State Government, culminating in a decision to prefer the present appeal; thereafter, procedural formalities such as appointment



of Officer-in-Charge, collection of records, and coordination with the Advocate General's Office were completed, which consumed reasonable time. However, the explanation essentially discloses movement of files and administrative correspondence within the departments, and no material has been placed on record to demonstrate that prompt and diligent steps were taken within the prescribed period of limitation.

9. It is well settled that the law of limitation binds the State and its instrumentalities in the same manner as any other litigant. Administrative or bureaucratic procedures cannot be accepted as a ground for condonation of delay as a matter of course. The appellants have not shown any exceptional or unavoidable circumstance which prevented them from approaching this Court within the period of limitation. The reasons assigned, being general in nature and based primarily on departmental processing of the matter, do not constitute "sufficient cause" within the meaning of law.

10. This Court is further of the view that the pleadings made in the application for condonation of delay do not disclose any satisfactory explanation for the prolonged delay. The grounds urged are largely routine and relate to internal administrative processes of the State Government. The State, having a structured administrative and legal framework, is expected to act with due diligence and promptitude in pursuing legal remedies. The chronology placed on record reflects avoidable delay of prompt action on the part of concerned authorities.



11. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we are not inclined to condone the delay of about 86 days in filing the present writ appeal. Consequently, the application for condonation of delay is **rejected**. As a result, the writ appeal stands dismissed on the ground of delay and laches, without entering into the merits of the case.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice